

Applicant: Juha Maijala et al.  
Application No.: 10/507,437  
Response to Office action mailed Jan. 10, 2007  
Response filed April 30, 2007

### Remarks

Claims 21–37 remain pending in the application, claims 23 and 34–35 are withdrawn, and claims 36–37 are new. In the Office action dated Jan. 10, 2007, claims 21, 25, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 21, 22, and 24–31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Williams* US 3,549,403 in view of *Fisher* US 3,521,558; and claims 32–33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Williams* US 3,549,403 in view of *Fisher* and further in view of *Liberto*.

In the Office action the examiner suggests for applicant's use the proper section headings for a patent application indicating that the examiner may not be aware of the Clean Copy of Substitute Specification which is in the electronic file wrapper with a mailroom date of 09-13-2004, specification 28 pages. (Note this is distinct from that specification of the same mailroom date with 22 pages.) The specification has been amended with respect to paragraph [0039] correcting ~~recharged~~ to precharged based on page 12, line 12, of the PCT publication WO 03/076083, the error also being apparent from context. The specification has been amended with respect to paragraph [0062] correcting "The roll [[10]] 9 may be a resilient roll and the roll 10 may be a hard heated roll." the error also being apparent from context.

Applicant has amended claims 21 and 25 to reflect that the % is on the weight basis as shown in paragraph [0028] of the substitute specification. Claim 28 has been amended to claim the first film which does have an antecedent basis. Claims 21 and 25 have been amended to supply omitted spaces between values and units.

Claim 21 has been amended to claim applying the charged particles to form the coating with the arrangement of electrodes 2 shown in the figure. New claim 36 has been added to the method of forming a film with the arrangement of electrodes shown in the figure. Amended claim 21 and new claims 36–37 are based on the figure and ¶ [0059].

The art of record applied by the examiner does not show a method of applying a film with the electrodes which forming a row with the nozzle electrode.

Applicant: Juha Maijala et al.  
Application No.: 10/507,437  
Response to Office action mailed Jan. 10, 2007  
Response filed April 30, 2007

US 7,186,445 is not a reference because it has a priority date the same or later than the present application.

Applicant believes that no new matter has been added by this amendment.

Applicant submits that the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance. Favorable action thereon is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Patrick J.G. Stiennon, Reg. No. 34934

Attorney for Applicant

Stiennon & Stiennon

P.O. Box 1667

Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1667

(608) 250-4870

Amdt3.res

April 30, 2007 (12:08pm)

2